



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/814,042

03/20/2001

Kevin E. Crawford

END920000058US1(13761)

3522

7590

10/30/2006

Richard L. Catania, Esq.
Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/814,042	Applicant(s) CRAWFORD ET AL.	
	Examiner CESAR B. PAULA	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 8/9/2006.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claim 18 has been added. Claims 1-15, and 17-18 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 3/20/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 17 remain, and 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peiffer, in view of "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", Lemay et al, hereinafter Lemay, Sams.net, 1996, pp.219-229.

Regarding independent claim 1, Peiffer discloses *a client* browser for downloading of a web page(s)—*web content file* containing web page source data having certain layout-- from a *server*. The web page contains Javascript applets—*storing information in a scripted language format* (col.1, lines 53-65, col.5, lines 11-33, col.6, lines 16-33).

Moreover, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out renderable data, such as the filtering of html tags (data used to render the web page) from uppercase to lowercase, replacement of formatting code with stylesheet, data, and removal of data such as whitespaces—*renderable*--, comments, hard returns--*non-renderable*, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19). The filtering out of the non-renderable data does not alter the layout of the web page. The system identifies the hard return characters and then removes them--*identifying logic blocks in the web content file that are unused, and removing the identified, unused logic blocks from the web-content file*. Peiffer fails to explicitly teach *removing pre-identified subject matter in said scripted language*. However, Lemay teaches the use of Javascript functions and comments (using “//” marks) for rotating advertisement banners, which are annoying to some users (page 227, line 10-page 229, line 9, list. 12.4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peiffer, and Lemay and remove the Javascript comments in the web page, because Peiffer teaches above the benefit of stripping off non-renderable or unneeded data from a web page, thereby, thereby reducing the amount of data that has to be transmitted, and speeding up the display of the web page.

Furthermore, Peiffer teaches the sending of the filtered web page—*downloading to the browser the reduced size file* without the filtered objects—from the server to the requesting web

Art Unit: 2178

browser client for display (col.1, lines 53-65, col.2, lines 1-16, 33-56, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns,--*comments* etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, 31-56, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19). Peiffer fails to explicitly teach *the unused logic blocks are functions that are in the file but not used*. However, Lemay teaches the use of Javascript functions and comments (using “//” marks) for rotating advertisement banners, which are annoying to some users (page 227, line 10-page 229, line 9, list. 12.4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peiffer, and Lemay, because Peiffer teaches above the benefit of stripping off unneeded data from a web page, thereby, thereby reducing the amount of data that has to be transmitted, and speeding up the display of the web page.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns,

Art Unit: 2178

which are repeated throughout the HTML file—*consolidating the duplicated logic blocks into one entity* of markup language representing the HTML lines—by deleting the non-renderable data—*shortening recurring identifiers* --, which are not needed, from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19). The system identifies the hard return characters and then removes them-- *identifying logic blocks that are duplicated on the web-content file*.

Claims 6-9 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 1-4 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 11-14 are directed towards a program storage device for storing the steps found in claims 1-4 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 1, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource. The web page is then sent to the browser client (col.2, lines 1-16, 33-56, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19). In other words, the display of the web page takes place at the client, without any recompilation after the size has been reduced at the server.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 1, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out data, such as whitespaces, comments, ASCII hard

Art Unit: 2178

returns, which are repeated throughout the HTML file— *shortening recurring identifiers, and said identifiers are not part of a tagged language.* (col.2, lines 1-16, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19).

6. Claims 5, 10, and 15 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peiffer, in view of Ross (Pat.# 6,163,780, 12/19/2000).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 4, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource— *consolidating into one logic blocks* of markup language representing the lines-- by filtering out the non-renderable data, because it does not perform a vital function to the web browser client for fails to explicitly teach *the consolidating step includes the step of identifying duplicated functions and replacing the duplicated functions with a reference to a single function in a library.* However, Ross teaches reducing the size or condensing of JAVA code by replacing each method or function in the code with a reference to the location to that method within a sorted class list—*single function in a library* (col.2, lines 9-11, 29-41, 54-67, col.3, lines 8-26). In other words, the system identifies the additional functions, and then replaces them with the reference(s). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peiffer, and Ross, because the benefit of compressing computer code so as to remove unnecessary code and data to shorten access, and execution times (col.1, lines 48-

Art Unit: 2178

col.2, line 26). This in turn would lessen the load on the limited resources of the small device such as the one.

Claim 10 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claim 5, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 15 directed towards a program storage device for storing the steps found in claim 5, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15, and 17 have been considered but are not persuasive. Regarding claims 1, 6, and 11, the Applicant states that the references do not teach or suggest reducing the size of a web content file in order to prepare that file for downloading over a computer network, by identifying logic blocks that are unused in the file and removing the identified, unused logic blocks. (page 8). The Examiner disagrees, Peiffer teaches the sending of the filtered web page—*downloading to the browser the reduced size file* without the filtered objects—from the server to the requesting web browser client for display (col.1, lines 53-65, col.2, lines 1-16, 33-56, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19), thus, the transmission is accelerated since the file is smaller in size. In other words, the system identifies the additional hard return characters, which are not necessary for the display of the web page, and then removes them-- *identifying logic blocks that are duplicated on the web-content file*.

Regarding claims 5, 10, and 15, the Applicant notes that Ross does not teach the identification, and removal of duplicated functions (page 10). The Examiner disagrees, because, Ross teaches reducing the size or condensing of JAVA code by replacing each method or function in the code with a reference to the location to that method within a sorted class list—*single function in a library* (col.2, lines 9-11, 29-41, 54-67, col.3, lines 8-26). In other words, the system identifies the additional functions, and then replaces them with the reference(s).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2178

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

10/26/06